REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is in response to the Advisory Action dated May 14, 2010 (for the final Office Action dated March 2, 2010), and this paper supplements the Amendment dated May 4, 2010. After entry of the foregoing claim amendments, Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 17, 19-21, 23-25, 27, and 31-40 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 are the independent claims. Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 are amended herein based on the Amendment dated May 4, 2010. New dependent Claims 37-40 are added herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

No new matter is believed to be added herein. The changes to the application are fully supported by the original disclosure, including, for example, original paragraphs [14] and [15].

Initially, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that the claim objections, the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 103

In the final Office Action dated March 2, 2010, Claims 1, 7, 17, 21, and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,295,556 ("Falcon"), in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0003371 ("Coulthard"), and further in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0088377 ("Henriquez"). Claims 3, 9, 19, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Falcon, in view of Coulthard, and further in view of Henriquez, and further in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0091850 ("Perholtz"). Claims 4, 10, 25, 27, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Falcon, in view of Coulthard, and further in view of Henriquez, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,039,709 ("Beadle"). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Falcon, in view of Coulthard, and further in view of Henriquez, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,181,524 ("Lele"). Claims 6, 12, 20, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Falcon, in view of Coulthard, and further in view of Henriquez, and further in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0183831 ("Ritchy"). Claims 11 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Falcon, in view of Coulthard, and further in view of Henriquez, and further in view of Beadle, and further in view of Lele. These rejections are respectfully traversed, and reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

The Advisory Action contends at pages 2-3 that Henriquez teaches "paragraphs 0006 and 0007 where comparison is made between using a Remote Desktop file (.rdp) and Henriquez's invention that permits local system to run an application residing on a remote system to create the appearance as if the application actually resides on the local system, by displaying the icons (on the *desktop*) at the local system . . . . Paragraph 0010 . . . Paragraph 0030 . . . Furthermore, paragraph 0036 discloses that when a user selects an icon associated with the remote application the local system 210 (see Fig. 2), a remote **desktop** connection is established; which is in contrast to remote accessing of a host computer (e.g., PC anywhere) . . .; thereby disclosing dynamically generated user interface on a local system that virtualizes the desktop of the remote system, with icons for connecting to and executing remote applications, and means to alter the icons as disclosed in paragraph 0036." (bold emphasis in original; italicized emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the foregoing contentions. Henriquez does not disclose or suggest the features of independent Claim 1, particularly with respect to at least the following features:

> ". . .the user interface comprises a software feature configured to allow the user to select a connection icon from the <u>desktop</u> of the remote computing device,

          wherein <u>selecting</u> the connection icon by the user allows a connection represented by the connection icon to become modifiable to <u>alter the connection</u> of the connection icon by the user. . . ," as recited in Claim 1. (emphasis added).

Henriquez's paragraph [0008] discloses, "the icon(s) displayed at the local computer substantially match . . . the iconic counterparts residing at the remote system(s)," and Henriquez's paragraph [0036] discloses, "when a user selects an icon associated with the remote application(s) on the local system(s) 210, a remote desktop connection is established."

These paragraphs, however, do not disclose or suggest a user selecting an icon from the <u>desktop</u>, as recited in Applicant's Claim 1. While Henriquez's paragraph [0008] teaches that an icon is displayed at a local computer, it does not teach that an icon is displayed on the <u>desktop</u> to be selected by a user. While Henriquez's paragraph [0036] teaches that a remote desktop connection is established (i.e., the local computer makes a remote desktop connection with the remote computer), it does not teach that an icon is displayed on the <u>desktop</u> to be selected by a user.

Furthermore, an advantage of the invention is being able to alter the connection of a connection icon by selecting the connection icon displayed on the desktop by the user. By way of illustration, but not limiting the scope of the claims, the instant application at paragraph [07] explains the problems of the conventional approach:

> "[07]   1) Management of connections from a desktop shell: The original desktop shell for the Microsoft® Windows® family of operating systems, known as Microsoft® Explorer, does <u>not allow a user to add, edit or delete connections</u> between a remote computing device and a local computing device from the <u>desktop</u> shell. For instance, users of applications such as Citrix®, which operates on the Microsoft® Windows® CE operating system, must use a specialized connection manager interface to administer each connection, and existing connections cannot be displayed on the desktop. Since the desktop is the primary interface between the operating system and the user, <u>the user must currently make additional burdensome steps in order to view or edit their connections</u>." (emphasis added)

Henriquez's paragraph [0036] discloses, "In contrast to remote accessing of a host computer (e.g., PC anywhere) where a window is opened displaying a same display as that of the host computer, at least a subset of the transmitted iconic data in connection with the subject invention is persistent at memory of the local computing system, and such subset of data can be updated with later format versions etc. as needed." In other words, a subset of iconic data transmitted from a remote system to a local system is stored at memory of the local system, and the subset of data can be updated at a later time with later format version. The foregoing passage may suggest at best that a data file for the icon is stored at the local system, and the stored data file can be later replaced with a later version of the data file. Even assuming the foregoing suggestion were correct, which Applicant does not concede, it still does not teach altering the connection of an icon, let alone the feature in which selecting the connection icon by the user from the desktop allows a connection represented by the connection icon to become modifiable to alter the connection of the connection icon by the user.

Henriquez, thus, does not disclose or teach the feature of "selecting the connection icon by the user allows a connection represented by the connection icon to become modifiable to alter the connection of the connection icon by the user," as recited in Claim 1. At least the explanations similar to those described above with respect to independent Claim 1 regarding the Henriquez reference are applicable to other independent Claims 7, 17 and 21.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 are allowable, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 are respectfully requested.

Furthermore, Henriquez does not disclose or teach the feature in which selecting the connection icon by the user from the desktop allows a connection configuration of the

connection icon to be <u>displayed, allowing the user to edit or delete the connection</u> of the connection icon, as recited in dependent Claims 37-40.

The other claims currently under consideration in the application are dependent from their respective independent claims discussed above and therefore are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least similar reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the dependent claims are respectfully requested.

The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be other reasons for patentability of any or all claims that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede, or an actual concession of, any issue with regard to any claim, or any cited art, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any questions, please call the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502203 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

/Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub/
Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub, Reg. # 39,266

18191 Von Karman Ave., Suite 500   **Please recognize our Customer No. 31824**
Irvine, CA 92612-7108   **as our correspondence address.**
Phone: 949.851.0633 SKL:lmt
Facsimile: 949.851.9348
Date: June 2, 2010